



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,267	08/29/2001	Cuc Hong	10017259-1	7215

7590 05/16/2006
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/941,267

Applicant(s)

HONG, CUC

Examiner

Jeff Piziali

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2006 and 03 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5 and 7-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Species I (i.e. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-27) in the reply filed on 24 February 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the alleged ground that, "there is no burden to examine both species because, both claims 5 and 6, directed to species 1 and 2 [sic] respectively, have already been examined" (see Page 10 of the 'Response to Election of Species Requirement' filed 24 February 2006). This quote by the applicant is taken as an open acknowledgement that at least two distinct and independent species are being instantly claimed.

Furthermore, the aforementioned alleged traversal ground is not found persuasive. The species are independent or distinct because the species do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive (wherein each separate species is drawn to a mutually exclusive types of input devices); the species are not obvious variants; and the species each have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, and effect. Furthermore, each species would require a different field of search (Species I requiring at least a separate field of search in class 345, subclass 168 -- i.e. keyboard type input devices; and Species II requiring at least a separate field of search in class 345, subclass 163 -- i.e. mouse type input devices), ultimately resulting in a burdensome search and examination. Although the aforementioned divergent subject matter was more or less intact at the time of the previous office action (mailed 3 August 2004), the applicants' claim amendments and ensuing remarks filed 3 November 2004 have persuaded the examiner that independent/distinct species are definitely being claimed, which if left unchecked would result in a serious examination burden henceforth. Additionally, it should be noted that

Art Unit: 2629

although both species were examined in the past by ex-examiner Paul Bell, this is the first time that examiner Jeff Piziali has examined the instant application.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claim 6 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 24 February 2006.
3. This application contains claim 6 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the 'Response to Election of Species Requirement' filed 24 February 2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 11, 12, 19, 20, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A) in view of Ma (US 6,078,407 A).

With regard to claim 1, Bradbury teaches a single unit system (figure 1), comprising: an enclosure (figure 1, item 1), a computer system configured and arranged in the enclosure (see

Art Unit: 2629

column 2, lines 27-51), a scanning module (i.e. optical scanner) arranged in the enclosure; and a plurality of personal computer components including a CPU, memory, an input device, and an output device, a printing module, and a video cam (see column 2, lines 27-51). Bradbury does not expressly disclose a display connected to the enclosure using a rotatable connector.

However, Ma does disclose a single unit system (figure 1), comprising: an enclosure, a computer system configured and arranged in the enclosure (figure 1, item 4), a scanning module arranged in the enclosure (figure 1, item 3) and a display connected to the enclosure using a rotatable connector (figure 1, item 12, column 1, line 67), wherein the display is operable to be rotated on the rotatable connector to an open position to view information on the display and is operable to be rotated on the rotatable connector to a closed position where information on the display is not viewable, and in the closed position the display substantially covers a portion of the scanning module (figure 1).

Bradbury and Ma are analogous art, because they are from the shared field of portable computers, portable computer peripherals, portable computer housing devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to house Ma's portable computer and scanner arrangement within Bradbury's carrying case, so as to transport the computer hardware, while isolating it from a hostile environment/atmosphere (see Bradbury: Abstract and Column 1, Lines 7-11).

With regard to claim 11, the combination of Bradbury/Ma teaches the scanning module is disposed in the enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer system and the power supply port inside the system enclosure (see Bradbury figure 6), to scan a document placed in the

Art Unit: 2629

system enclosure (Since it was shown to have a scanner in the enclosure this use is viewed as merely directed towards an "OBVIOUS INTENDED USE" of the work station as the standard function of a scanner is to scan a document).

With regard to claim 12, the combination of Bradbury/Ma teaches the printing module is disposed in the enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer system and the power supply port inside the system enclosure (see Bradbury figure 6), to print a document controlled by the computer components (Since it was shown to have a printer in the enclosure this use is viewed as merely directed towards an "OBVIOUS INTENDED USE" of the work station as the standard function of a scanner is to print a document).

With regard to claim 19, the combination of Bradbury/Ma teaches wherein the portion of the scanning module comprises a transparent area of the scanning module and in the closed position the display substantially covers the transparent area (SEE MA figure 1).

With regard to claim 20, the combination of Bradbury/Ma teaches further comprising a cover rotatably connected between the display and the transparent area (SEE MA figure 1).

With regard to claim 25, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 12; furthermore, the combination of Bradbury/Ma teaches further comprising the scanning module and the printing module use one movement system operable to move a scan head for the

Art Unit: 2629

scanning module and operable to move paper through a document feed path for the printing module (SEE MA column 1, lines 3-47).

6. Claims 3, 9, 10, 13, 21-24, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A) in view of Bogert (US 6,062,357 A) and Ma (US 6,078,407 A).

With regard to claim 3, Bradbury teaches a compact, self-contained, portable personal computer (PC) system (See Bradbury column 2, lines 27-51), comprising: a system enclosure having a plurality of computer components contained therein, the computer components including a CPU and a memory, and a power supply port disposed on one side of the system enclosure, a scanning module, disposed in the system enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer components and the power supply port inside the system enclosure (see Bradbury figure 6), to scan a document placed in the system enclosure (Since it was shown to have a scanner in the enclosure this use is viewed as merely directed towards an "OBVIOUS INTENDED USE" of the work station as the standard function of a scanner is to scan a document); a printing module, disposed in the system enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer components (See Bradbury figure 6) and the power supply port inside the system enclosure (SEE Bradbury column 6, lines 32-43), to print a document controlled by the computer components (Since it was shown to have a printer in the enclosure this use is viewed as merely directed towards an "OBVIOUS INTENDED USE" of the work station as the normal function of a printer is to print a document).

Art Unit: 2629

Bradbury does not teach, "a flat screen display module, disposed on top of the system enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer components and the power supply port inside the system enclosure the flat screen display being rotatably coupled to the system enclosure allowing the flat screen display to be viewable in an open position and to rest on the top of the system enclosure in a closed position, wherein in the closed position the display substantially covers a portion of the scanning module" (note See Bradbury column 2, line 44 "INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE" to now patent 5,212,628 where it's figure 5 items 102, 100 and 74 illustrates some of these claimed features).

However Ma teaches all of these above limitation as shown in the rejection of claim 1 above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bradbury case to have above features as taught by MA because MA teaches how to combine a portable computer and a scanner into a compact unit convenient for carrying by hand (SEE MA lines 19-41) and since the Bradbury case has limited space this is essential.

Bradbury does not teach, "and at least one WHEEL to transport the system by pulling the first handle, wherein the first handle is extendable from the system enclosure and RETRACTABLE into the system enclosure".

Bogert teaches, "and at least one WHEEL to transport the system by pulling the first handle, wherein the first handle is extendable from the system enclosure and RETRACTABLE into the system enclosure" (abstract line 4, figure 1, items 21 and 2 and figure 6, column 1, lines 4-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bradbury case to have WHEELS and RETRACTABLE handle as taught by Bogert because Bogert provides the motivation for using these features to improve the Bradbury apparatus (SEE Bogert column 1, lines 7-17 "popular" "enable the weight of the bags to be carried on the wheels" and "handle extends to a convenient reach when in use and retracts out of the way when not in use").

With regard to claim 9, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert teaches the system of claim 3, further comprising a case to house the, wherein the case includes a first opening for accessing the first handle (SEE Bogert figure 1 items 1, 2 and 200 also this feature is addressed in regards to claim 1 above).

With regard to claim 10, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert teaches the system of claim 9, further comprising a second handle for carrying/lifting the system (SEE Bogert figure 4, items 373 or 374 and one would be motivated to use the second handle when in a hurry in the airport walking up an escalator where it would not be efficient to use the wheels).

With regard to claim 13, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert was shown above in claims 1, 3, 9, 10, and 12 to teach all of the limitations for example, means for enclosing, such as "a system enclosure" means for scanning a document, such as "a scanning module" 1 means for printing a document, such as "a printing module" means for displaying information, such as

Art Unit: 2629

"a flat screen display module", means for pulling the means for enclosing, such as "a handle" means for moving the means for enclosing, such as "a one wheel."

With regard to claims 21 and 23, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert teaches wherein the portion of the scanning module comprises a transparent area of the scanning module and in the closed position the display substantially covers the transparent area (SEE MA figure 1).

With regard to claims 22 and 24, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert teaches further comprising a cover rotatably connected between the display and the transparent area (SEE MA figure 1).

With regard to claim 26, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claims 12 and 25.

With regard to claim 27, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claims 12 and 25.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A)/Ma (US 6,078,407 A)/Bogert (US 6,062,357 A) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Bernard (US 5,675,524 A) and Lee (US 6,219,229 B1).

With regard to claim 4, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert does not illustrate; "the system of claim 3, further comprising a tray disposed at bottom of the system enclosure and an input device stored inside the tray when the input device is not in use, wherein the tray includes a docking station port for communicating with a second computer system."

Lee teaches, "a tray disposed at bottom of the system enclosure and an input device stored inside the tray when the input device is not in use" (SEE Lee figure 2, items 16, 35, and 36).

Bernard teaches, "a docking station port for communicating with a second computer system" (SEE Bernard abstract, figure 2 and figure 4, item 102).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert case to have "a tray disposed at the bottom of case and an input device stored inside tray when input device is not in use" as taught by Lee because Lee provides the motivation for using these features to improve the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert (SEE Lee figure 2, where it is self evident that this feature saves space, provides a place to store input device when not in use and provides a support when the input device is being used).

And in addition it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert to have "a docking station pod for communicating with a second computer system" incorporated into a tray as taught by Bernard because Bernard provides the motivation for using these features to improve the Bradbury/Ma/Bogert apparatus (SEE Bernard column 1, lines 35-60, "The communications

Art Unit: 2629

device provides multiple alternative communication capabilities for the portable computer" which would of made the apparatus more marketable).

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A), Ma (US 6,078,407 A), Bogert (US 6,062,357 A), Lee (US 6,219,229 B1), Bernard (US 5,675,524 A) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Inagaki et al. (US 6,504,529 B1).

With regard to claim 5, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert/Bernard/Lee suggest, "keyboard or mouse operatively associated with the computer components in such a manner that an input from the keyboard is stored in the memory and displayable on the flat screen display" (Since the combination was shown to have a keyboard or mouse this recitation of use is viewed as merely directed towards the standard and conventional use of the keyboard in the work station). With further regard to claim 5, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert/Lee/Bernard does not illustrate the system of claim 4, "wherein the input device is an infrared keyboard or mouse."

Inagaki et al. teaches "wherein the input device is an infrared keyboard or mouse" (SEE Inagaki et al. figure 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert/Lee/Bernard apparatus to have infrared keyboard or mouse as taught by Inagaki et al. because being wireless gives the user more options as to set up in relation to the display and being able to remotely hold the keyboard frees up desk space for writing notes or putting paper documents in easy view.

9. Claims 7, 14, 15, 16, and 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combination of Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A)/Ma (US 6,078,407 A)/Bogert (US 6,062,357 A) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Kikinis (US 5,870,624 A).

With regard to claim 7, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert does not illustrate; "the system of claim 3, wherein the system enclosure includes a document FEED-IN SLOT and a document EXIT SLOT disposed ON OPPOSITE SIDES of the system enclosure, respectively, such that the scanning module scans the document fed into the document feed-in slot and outputs the document at the document exit slot" though they do show using a scanner and printer and these devices generally have input and output slots for documents.

Kikinis teaches a document feed-in slot and a document exit slot disposed on opposite sides of the system enclosure, respectively, such that the scanning module scans the document fed into the document feed-in slot and outputs the document at the document exit slot" (SEE Kikinis figure 1a, item 15, 17 and 23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination Bradbury/Ma/Bogert to have a document feed-in slot and a exit slot disposed on opposite sides of the enclosure as taught by Kikinis because Kikinis provides the motivation for using these features to improve the of combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert apparatus (SEE Kikinis last three lines of abstract, "The device provides a SMALL, relatively INEXPENSIVE, and compact package which may be placed at a user's computer workstation" and column 1, lines 42-50, "What is CLEARLY NEEDED is a low-cost device that COMBINES PRINTING AND SCANNING FUNCTIONS and is yet small enough

Art Unit: 2629

to be placed conveniently on a user's desk, or MOUNTED IN the base of a video monitor or in THE CASE of a computer. Also since Bradbury clearly shows scanning and printing it is just a simple matter of modifying these elements for the motivational reasons given in Kikinis.

With regard to claims 14 and 15, the limitations were rejected above.

With regard to claims 16 and 17 the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert/Kikinis teaches the system of claim 13, further comprising a printing input port means for feeding documents to the means for printing and further comprising a printing output port means for ejecting documents from the means for printing (See Kikinis figure 1a).

10. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combination of Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A)/Ma (US 6,078,407 A)/Bogert (US 6,062,357 A) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Ma (US 5,880,928 A).

With regard to claim 8, the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert does not illustrate; "The system of claim 3, further comprising a video cam, DISPOSED ON the flat screen display, to record a view around the system", though it does show using a video camera.

Ma teaches "a video cam, disposed on the flat screen display, to record a view around the system" (SEE Ma figure 2, item 222).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert to have a video cam on the display as taught Ma because Ma provides the motivation for using these features to improve the

Art Unit: 2629

combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert apparatus (SEE Ma column 1, lines 11-25, and the exact placement of the camera in the combination of Bradbury/Ma/Bogert would be simply where it would record what is desired. Usually a camera would be positioned as in Ma for purposes like video conferencing).

With regard to claim 18, the limitation of the system of claim 13, further comprising means for capturing images of an environment outside of the means for enclosing for example such as "a video cam" in claims 1, 2, 3, 8, and 13.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 3 November 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant complains that claim 2 was improperly rejected in the previous office action (see Pages 11-13 of the 'Amendment' filed 3 November 2004). However, this complaint is considered a moot point, because the applicant has since canceled claim 2. Moreover, the applicant inaccurately asserts, "If this rejection is maintained for claim 1 as amended herein with new motivation or if the rejection is changed, the next office action must be non-final." It is respectfully noted that amended claim 1 recites subject matter different and distinct from canceled claim 2. Canceled claim 2 previously recited, "***the computer system comprises*** a plurality of personal computer components." In contrast, newly amended claim 1 presently recites, "***a single unit system, comprising...*** a plurality of personal computer components."

The applicant also contends the motivation for combining the cited prior art references of Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A) and Ma (US 6,078,407 A) is improper, because a scanner disclosed in some other non-relied upon art reference (namely US 5,212,628 A) is smaller than Ma's scanner, and because Bradbury's carrying case would be less portable and heavier if increased in size to hold Ma's scanner (see Pages 13-14 of the 'Amendment' filed 3 November 2004). The examiner respectfully disagrees. All three aforementioned references (not to mention all the instant claims) are utterly silent on the matter of structural sizes, dimensions, and weights. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have no reason to doubt that Ma's portable computer and scanner arrangement [Ma: Fig. 1] would readily fit within Bradbury's "carrying case for a portable work station" [Bradbury: Fig. 1]. Even if arguably, Bradbury's carrying case did require enlarging; it certainly would have been within the skill of an artisan at the time of invention to do so. Afterall, a bigger carrying case would allow the user to carry more stuff -- which is typically a preferred option for many people.

The applicant next contends the motivation for combining the cited prior art references of Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A) and Bogert (US 6,062,357 A) is improper, because Bogert's carrying case wheels "would prove useless" in Bradbury's envisioned wet and sandy usage environment and because Bogert's retractable case handle would render it difficult/impossible to seal Bradbury's carrying case (see Pages 14-15 of the 'Amendment' filed 3 November 2004). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Bradbury's carrying case is nowhere disclosed as being limited to use in "wet" and "sandy" "outdoor" environments. Furthermore, it is doubtful that Bogert's carrying case wheels would "would prove useless" in such environments. Wheels, it is humbly submitted by this examiner, have proven themselves quite useful in all sorts of environments --

hostile, wet, sandy, outdoor, and otherwise. Additionally, Bogert's retractable case handle [Bogert: Fig. 1; 2 & 3] would appear to have no prohibitive impact on the seal-ability of Bogert's own carrying case [Bogert: Fig. 1; 10]. So one skilled in the art should encounter no difficulty incorporating Bogert's retractable case handle with Bradbury's sealable carrying case [Bradbury: Fig. 1].

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning (see Pages 15-16 of the 'Amendment' filed 3 November 2004), it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references (see Pages 15-16 of the 'Amendment' filed 3 November 2004), reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The applicant contends it would not have been obvious to combine the cited prior art references of Bernard (US 5,675,524 A), Lee (US 6,219,229 B1), and Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A) is improper, because there is not sufficient space in Bradbury's carrying case [Bradbury: Fig. 1] to house Bernard's docking station [Bernard: Fig. 2] and Lee's tray [Lee: Fig. 2; 16], and because Lee's computer and tray weren't intended to be hand-carried in Bernard's mentioned hostile usage environment (see Page 15 of the 'Amendment' filed 3 November 2004). The

Art Unit: 2629

examiner again respectfully disagrees. All three aforementioned references (not to mention all the instant claims) are utterly silent on the matter of structural sizes/dimensions. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have no reason to doubt that there existed sufficient space in Bradbury's carrying case [Bradbury: Fig. 1] to house Bernard's docking station [Bernard: Fig. 2] and Lee's tray [Lee: Fig. 2; 16]. Even if arguably, Bradbury's carrying case did require enlarging; it certainly would have been within the skill of an artisan at the time of invention to do so.

Afterall, a bigger carrying case would allow the user to carry more stuff -- which is typically a preferred option for many people (at least those people with a lot of stuff needing carrying).

Moreover, even if arguably Lee's computer and tray weren't intended to be hand-carried in a hostile usage environment, one disclosed advantage afforded by Bradbury's carrying case is that it would Lee's computer and tray to be operated in just such a hostile environment (see Bradbury: Column 1, Line 10).

The applicant also contends it would not have been obvious to combine the cited prior art references of Bradbury (US 5,226,540 A), Ma (US 6,078,407 A), Bogert (US 6,062,357 A), and Kikinis (US 5,870,624 A) is improper, because some other non-relied upon art reference (namely US 5,212,628 A) shows arms [Fig. 6; 74] which "would block any slots used to feed in documents or output documents to the printer [Fig. 6; 200]" (see Pages 16-17 of the 'Amendment' filed 3 November 2004). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In fact, the applicant's arguments here are moot, because the reference being argued against has not even been applied in any formal rejections.

By such reasoning, rejection of the claims is deemed necessary, proper, and thereby maintained at this time.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2629

The applicant is hereby notified that the examiner's art unit has recently changed from Art Unit 2673 to Art Unit 2629, please direct all future correspondence accordingly. Thank you.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



J.P.
12 May 2006



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600